

RECEIVED  
CLERK'S OFFICE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
RECORDED

2013 APR 12 P : 34

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF

PY \_\_\_\_\_ DEPUTY

Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox

Motion to Legally Relate U.S. District Court Southern  
District of New York (Foley Square),  
CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS  
( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division )

vs.

Defendant Marc J. Randazza, and ALL Named Defendants

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, request this court to enter U.S. District Court Southern District of New York (Foley Square), CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS, Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division First Department, Departmental Disciplinary Committee et al Assigned to: Judge Shira A. Scheindlin as a Related Case to 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF.

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, have been reporting on the iViewit Technology, Eliot Bernstein Story for over 3 years and have since been targeted to shut down my online investigative reporting.

**Named Defendants of 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF have retaliated against iViewit Technology, Eliot Bernstein. District of Nevada Case 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL is legally related to 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF, as the docket shows. Eliot Bernstein is a named defendant in District of Nevada Case 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL.**

Defendant Marc J. Randazza contacted Eliot Bernstein to attempt to get him to conspire against me, Plaintiff Crystal Cox. Claiming that he would not sue Eliot Bernstein if he aided Defendant Randazza in his efforts to shut down Crystal Cox.

Defendant Marc Randazza sued Eliot Bernstein (iViewit) and myself, Pro Se Litigant Crystal Cox, in retaliation to shut down my whistleblower media, blogs reporting on the iViewit Technology case and the involvement of Defendant Marc Randazza's clients, this is related case. District of Nevada 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL, and thereby 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF is directly related to U.S. District Court Southern District of New York (Foley Square), CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS. ( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division ).



Defendant Marc Randazza of 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL has retaliated against iViewit Technology, Eliot Bernstein, through this legal action and against defendant Investigative Blogger Crystal Cox, in order to suppress information on the iViewit Technology.. District of Nevada Case 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL is legally related to 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF, as the docket shows. Eliot Bernstein is a named defendant in District of Nevada Case 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL.

Defendant Marc J. Randazza contacted Eliot Bernstein to attempt to get him to conspire against me, Plaintiff Crystal Cox, and make some deal with Defendant Marc Randazza.. Claiming that he would not sue Eliot Bernstein if Bernstein aided Defendant Randazza in his efforts to shut down Crystal Cox, though this directly shut down blogs reporting on the iViewit Technology Story (U.S. District Court Southern District of New York (Foley Square), CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS. ( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division ) AND U.S. District Court Southern District of New York, Civil Case Number 1:07-cv-09599-SAS. (Anderson v. The State of New York et al) which is legally related cases as show on both of those case dockets.

I, Defendant Crystal L. Cox, request this court to enter U.S. District Court Southern District of New York (Foley Square), CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS, Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division First Department, Departmental Disciplinary Committee et al, Assigned to: Judge Shira A. Scheindlin, as a Related Case to District of Nevada 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF.

Over the last 3 years I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, have reported on, received tips on, took interviews on those connected with the Christine Anderson Whistle Blower case out of New York ( U.S. District Court Southern District of New York, Civil Case Number 1:07-cv-09599-SAS. ) Anderson v. The State of New York et al, this case is legally related to CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS ( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division ).

I have also reported on connected issues, people, and corporations such as Andrew Cuomo as New York Attorney General, James Pelzer, Rita Adler ex Chief Counsel of the NYS Grievance Committee for Tenth Judicial District, many stories regarding the Tenth Judicial District, New York's Second Department, State Attorney General Office, Nicole Corrado Esq Whistle Blower, New York Senate Judiciary Committee, Naomi Goldstein, New York State Bar, New York Ethics Committee, JP Morgan, Peter Sivere Whistle Blower, Elliot Spitzer, Enron, George Demos, Philip Falcone FCC Issues, Warner Bros., Time Warner, Proskauer Rose Law Firm, SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING Senator John Sampson Chairman, Judicial & Attorney Disciplinary Process in the State of New York and many more involved in the New York Judicial Process and connected to the "Cleaner", Whistle Blower case brought forth by Christine Anderson.

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, have been the target of widespread whistle blower retaliation, the goal being to shut down my investigative reporting. The tactics used to stop the flow of information on my investigative blogs has cause irreparable damage to my sources, informants, and to my personal life, business and reputation.

The Felony Crimes alleged by Anderson, directly relate to this RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Evidence was obtained on Thursday, January 24, 2013, confirming the position of a former NYS attorney ethics committee insider that various illegal actions were employed by New York State employees to target and/or protect select attorneys.

During the wrongful termination case of former Manhattan ethics attorney Christine Anderson, it was revealed that New York State employees had a nick-name for supervising ethics attorney Naomi Goldstein. Naomi Goldstein was, "The Cleaner."

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, believe I am a "TARGET" of these wire tapes, surveillance, and retaliations and therefore 2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF is legally related to this case.

"A NEW YORK SUPREME COURT WHISTLEBLOWER ATTORNEY, CHRISTINE C. ANDERSON, ESQ. ("Anderson") MAKES FELONY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS IN US FEDERAL COURT AND BEFORE THE NEW YORK SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE. ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SENIOR RANKING OFFICIALS OF THE US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, THE NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, THE NEW YORK SUPREME COURT, THE NEW YORK SUPREME COURT DISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENTS, "FAVORED LAWYERS AND LAW FIRMS" [Footnote 3] and names a "CLEANER" [Footnote 4] , as revealed in federal court testimony, a one Naomi Goldstein."

"This "whitewashing" sometimes involved burying cases or destroying evidence, so that certain complaints were inevitably, unavoidably, dismissed. I witnessed this destruction of evidence myself. Other reported misconduct involves victimizing attorneys lacking privileged positions or connections."

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, believe I am "targeted" also as I have been reporting on these issues for over 3 years, and have named many in this RICO complaint that are connected to the Christine Anderson case and it's legally related iMewit Technology, Eliot Bernstein Case. CML CASE #: 1:07-cv-11196-SAS ( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division ).

### **"Ethics" Retaliation Machine Was Real**

The focus of this initial article concerns the 1st and 2nd judicial department, though the illegal methods are believed to have been utilized statewide in all 4 judicial departments.

The Cleaner's Man says that he would receive a telephone call from Naomi Goldstein, who would say, "we have another target, I want to meet you..." The Man also says that Thomas Cahill, a former DDC Chief Counsel, and Sherry Cohen, a former Deputy-Chief Counsel, were knowledgeable of all of Naomi Goldstein's activity with him and his team.

The meetings, he says, were usually at a park or restaurant near the Manhattan Attorney ethics offices (the "DDC") in lower Manhattan, however he did over time meet Goldstein at his office, the DDC or in movie theater- a venue picked by Naomi. Goldstein would provide her Man with the name, and other basic information, so that the Man's team could begin their "investigation." The Man specifically recalls Naomi Goldstein advising him to "get as much damaging information as possible on Christine [Anderson]."

The Man says that they then tapped Ms. Anderson's phones, collected ALL "ISP" computer data, including all emails, and set up teams to surveil Anderson 24/7. The Man says he viewed the improperly recorded conversations and ISP data, and then personally handed those items over to Naomi Goldstein.

Anderson should not, however, feel like she was a lone target. According to The Man, "....over 125 cases were interfered with...." And there were dozens of "targeted" lawyers, says The Man, adding, that the actions of his teams were clearly "intentionally obstructing justice." If Ms. Goldstein had identified the Ethics Committee's newest target as an attorney, it was quickly qualified with whether the involved lawyer was to be "screwed or UNscrewed." Unscrewed was explained as when an attorney needed to be "protected" or "saved" even if they did, in fact, have a major ethics problem.

The Man has a nice way of explaining his actions, the "authority" to so act and, he says, over 1.5 million documents as proof..... The U.S. Attorney is aware of The Man and his claims...." Christine Anderson, Nicole Corrado and Other Public Office Whistleblowers cited, also gave explanation for why Judges and Attorneys at Law are now desperately trying to grant themselves immunity for felony crimes and attempting to use the s and other Government officials as accomplice in the cover-up. I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, believe I am "targeted" and therefore seek to legally relate these cases.

**In RICO / Racketeering Cases,** it is essential to prove pattern and history. 1:07-cv-11196-SAS ( Bernstein et al v. Appellate Division ) will provide such proof and essential to the merits, and matter of law of District of Nevada RICO 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF.

**Note to Court:**

This is my **second filing** of this Motion to Relate Bernstein et al v. Appellate. I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, mailed this motion previously to this court, via Certified Mail. The motion was not placed on the docket. When I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, enquired as to what happened, here is the eMail details with Peggy Vannozzi, Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du' US District Court, District of Nevada.

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox eMailed the Following to Peggy Vannozzi, Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du' US District Court, District of Nevada;

"Hello,

Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox here, I noticed an update to the docket today, I noticed that motions I mailed were added to the docket, I also noticed, that 2 motions were missing and want to make sure they were not overlooked in the packet.

Thank you for your time,"

**Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:**

"Hello,

You mention that 2 motions were missing and you wanted to make sure they were not overlooked in the packet. These items were filed yesterday, with the documents mailed to you at the address you provided. You will not be able to view the documents from this email as the links will connect to the Nevada CM/ECF log in page and you do not have permission yet to file. Please review this list and tell me what you think is missing.

-----+-----
03/2   vi   MOTION for Pro Se Litigant to File Electronically filed
7/20   ew   by Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Motion ripe 3/27/2013. (AC)
13   7   (Entered: 03/28/2013)
-----+-----
03/2   vi   MOTION to Enjoin the U.S. Attorney General filed by
7/20   ew   Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013.

13	8	(AC) (Entered: 03/28/2013)	
03/2	vi	MOTION Requesting Reason for Recusal/Removal of	
7/20	ew	Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe filed by Plaintiff	
13	9	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)	
		(Entered: 03/28/2013)	
03/2	vi	MOTION for Appointment of Counsel filed by Plaintiff	
7/20	ew	Crystal L Cox. Motion ripe 3/27/2013. (AC) (Entered:	
13	10	03/28/2013)	
03/2	vi	MOTION Certifying Completion of CM/ECF Tutorial filed by	
7/20	ew	Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013.	
13	11	(AC) (Entered: 03/28/2013)	
03/2	vi	MOTION to Continue In Forma Pauperis filed by Plaintiff	
7/20	ew	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)	
13	12	(Entered: 03/28/2013)	
03/2	vi	MOTION to Legally Relate the Southern District of New	
7/20	ew	York case no. 1:07-cv-09599-SAS filed by Plaintiff	
13	13	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)	
		(Entered: 03/28/2013)	

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"Thanks You I have attached the 2 documents missing, maybe they were mistakenly taken as part of the one motion to relate. There were 2 other motions to related in the packet, i have attached them here as reference to help find them. , as they were all mailed together.

what is missing is two motions to relate.

I have seen the docket, thank you for the information.

thank you for your time

Crystal L. Cox  
Pro Se Litigant"

**Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:**

"I found the original documents you sent and these two documents you have attached are not part of the documents we have. I spoke to the person who opened the mail on 3/27 and she said that she put the documents that were docketed are the ones that were in the envelope.

You will need to mail these two documents to the Court. I cannot download them.

Peggie Vannozzi  
Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du  
US District Court, District of Nevada"

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"oK thank you, I will remail. I am 100% sure they were in the packet, as I paid for the copies at the mail place and have my receipt. I will remail, however can you please ask them to check through one more time, they did not have a paper clip, they were one page motions. There were in the packet, I am absolutely sure. So they must have been lost somehow.

Crystal L. Cox "

**Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:**

"I did notice that the Motion relating civil case 1:07-cv-11196-SAS is attached to document 13. It is better for you to re-mail the documents to minimize confusion rather than email me and ask me to make amendments to your documents. Thank you"

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"Ok, I am not asking for an amendment. I mailed motions to be filed, and they were not. I labeled each motion separate, and I signed them, I paid to print, to mail certified and I got a signature, I followed proper procedure and in no way asking for an amendment. I did it right the first time.

"I did notice that the Motion relating civil case 1:07-cv-11196-SAS is attached to document 13" You said this, if it accidentally was attached, that is besides the proper procedure that each motion to relate was filed, labeled and signed as separate documents.

I filed in Pauperis, it is hard for me to get to town, to print, to pay to mail, to certify a second time for a motion that was filed properly. Thank you for your time, though you have not helped me with this issue. I know exactly what was in the envelope, the courts there have messed up, not me, please do not think I have asked for an amendment or special favors, I have NOT asked for an amendment in any way.

I did this right and at my own personal cost. Which I now have to redo, because they are not seen for some reason as separate motions, though they are for sure labeled as separate motions and signed separately.

I even wrote how many pages were in each.

I will reDo this, however please understand my frustration, as this is a RICO, Racketeering, Conspiracy complaint, and I am under constant sabotage, attack, threats, harassment, and having documents disappear. I will mention this in future motions, as I believe that the District of Nevada has discriminated against me and has favored whom are now defendants in this case, and I am in another District of Nevada case where some are Plaintiffs. **I am not asking for an "amendment"**, I need that to be clear. I am asking for fair, unbiased treatment as a pro se litigant.

Thank You for your time, I will reMail when I get the money to.

Blessings to You..

**Crystal L. Cox**

**Pro Se Litigant”**

The eMail conversation Ended at that point, so I am re-mailing this motion to relate Bernstein et al v. Appellate.

Upon my knowledge and belief, this was a **deliberate act** to protect named defendants in a RICO / Racketeering case involving over 90 Defendants, which most are among the biggest tech companies, media companies and law firms in the world.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**On April 6th, 2013**

I hereby certify that I served the foregoing on:



Attention: Judge Mirada Du Court Clerk  
Las Vegas Courts  
District of Nevada Courts  
333 S. Las Vegas Blvd.  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Respectfully Submitted

Pro Se Plaintiff

District of Nevada 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF

Crystal L. Cox

PO Box 2027

Port Townsend, WA 98368

Crystal@CrystalCox.com